

### **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-6 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and Abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned "**Version with markings to show changes made.**"

In items 6 and 7 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner kindly indicated that claims 1, 3 and 5 are allowed, and that claims 2, 4 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In items 4 and 5 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 2, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because "[I]n claims 2 and 6, the intended scope of the claims are unclear and confusing because it is not clear as to how many fix[ed] and movable sheaves] are being claimed." And, in claim 4, "the intended scope of the claim is unclear and confusing because it is not clear as to what 'the other' and 'the one' is referring to."

Similarly, in item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2 and 6 because, according to the Examiner, "claim 1 clearly recites that one of the sheaves is a fixed sheave and the other is a movable sheave and it is not clear as to how claims 2 and 6 further limit independent claim 1."

First, regarding the rejection applied to claim 4, claim 4 has been amended to change "the other" to --said other of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave--, and to change "the one" to

--said one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave--. Both of these phrases find proper antecedent basis in claim 1.

Regarding the rejection as applied to claims 2 and 6, claim 2 has been slightly amended to change "the one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is the movable sheave" to --said one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is constituted by the movable sheave-- and, similarly, to change "the other of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is the fixed sheave" to --said other of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is constituted by the fixed sheave--.

Corresponding changes have been made to claim 6.

Although these changes are provided to slightly change the language to make it easier to understand what is intended, it is submitted that the language of original claims 2 and 6 was already definite and clear. In particular, in this regard, it is noted that the phrase "the one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave" as presented in each of claims 2 and 6 refers back to the element recited in claim 1 "one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave". In other words, claim 1 requires a particular one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave to be formed to have the inclined angle being constant from a radially inner part of the conical pressure surface to a radially outer part of the conical pressure surface. Claim 2 then further specifies that this particular one of the fixed and movable sheaves that has the recited characteristic of being "formed to have the inclined angle being constant from a radially inner part of the conical pressure surface to a radially outer part of the conical pressure surface" is in fact "the movable sheave". That is, claim 2 stated that "the one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is the movable sheave." The new language "said one of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave is constituted by the movable sheave" is equivalent to the previous language but is perhaps slightly easier to understand. Similar reasoning applies to the phrases "the other of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave" in claim 2, as well as the corresponding phrases in claim 6. If the Examiner has any further questions regarding these phrases, he is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss the meaning of these phrases.

It is noted that one additional correction has been made to the claim language. In particular, claim 1 has been revised by changing the phrase "wherein the fixed sheave and the movable sheave include a conical pressure surface ..." to --wherein each of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave includes a conical pressure surface ...--. This language more accurately recites the invention, since each of the fixed sheave and the movable sheave includes a conical pressure surface. This does not change the scope of claim 1, since it was apparent from a review of claim 1 that this was the intention of the claim language, since the claim language also referred to "the conical pressure surface of the fixed sheave and the conical pressure surface of the movable sheave" (see page 29, lines 16-18 of the original specification).

Thus, in view of the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 1-6, and the above amendments and explanations, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now clearly in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Izumi TAKAGI

By: 

Charles R. Watts  
Registration No. 33,142  
Attorney for Applicant

CRW/asd  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
June 15, 2005